

From: Alex Zarenin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/14/01 11:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

I would like to express my overall satisfaction with the wording of the proposed settlement. I think it properly addresses rights and obligations of all the parties and provides environment in which innovations from all sides may thrive.

I also think that provisions of this settlement will be beneficiary to consumers community by providing them with stable and rich operating environment without unduly limiting the choices and preferences.

It is true that Microsoft presently has a dominant role on the desktops; however this role was obtained as a result of fast and innovative development and, as a result, sufficiently good offering. Windows OS obtained its present position in competition with other OSes, such as OS/2, Macintosh, X\Windows etc. Moreover, even today its dominance is challenged daily with new offering (supported by pretty large companies, such as IBM, Sun, etc) - Linux, System 7 just to name a few. As such I don't think that Microsoft has a true monopoly, which would imply that they may stop development and just reap the benefits of previous work for times to come - it has to improve its offering every day just to maintain this leading position.

In my opinion the states that continue pressing additional charges against Microsoft and do not agree to the proposed settlement are just blinded by the Microsoft-bashing mentality - their proposals would skew the marketplace towards Microsoft competitors and would let mediocre companies, such as Netscape, to make huge profits of the consumers and corporations by selling to them products that otherwise comes from Microsoft for free (like browser or Media player).

Netscape Navigator version 2 was much better then Internet Explorer 2 - and it was dominating the market! However since then IE was greatly improving with each new release (and still was free!), while Netscape Navigator was lagging behind, which made it lose the market share.

Similarly other companies should compete with Microsoft by providing better products, which in these years of instant communications will immediately attract consumers' attention!

In conclusion I would like to suggest some minor additions to proposed settlement:

For section "C" I would suggest to allow Microsoft to imbed in OS tools

and features that would allow end users (and only end users!) to revert to Microsoft-provided versions of middleware and other tools, which were replaced by the OEM, if user feels that these replacements are detrimental to the stability or usability of the system. For example a user should be given an option to revert customized versions of the browser (installed, for example, by Comcast or AOL) to the vanilla version of this product.

For sections "D" and "E" I would suggest that Microsoft should not only made appropriate APIs and interfaces available to broad developers community (through MSDN or similar ways), but also take effort to submit them for non-binding review to corresponding committees (such as WWW consortium etc). The non-binding nature of these submission should not preclude Microsoft from implementing solutions that receive negative reviews; however negative reviews of appropriate APIs or interfaces will open the doors for competitors to provide alternative products, add-on tools etc.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to provide my comments to this settlement!
Alex Zarenin, Ph. D. in CS